

REMARKS

Claims 7-10 were pending and under consideration. In the FINAL Office Action of December 12, 2002, claims 7-10 were rejected.

In response, claims 7, 9-10 have been amended.

A. §112, First Paragraph Rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claims 9 and 10 as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 9 and 10 have been amended, per the Examiner's request, to recite a more specific, not approximate, range to a skilled artisan by deleting the word "about". Applicants respectfully submit the objection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

B. §103 (a) Rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narang et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,168,885) in view of Schneider et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,180,281), in further view of Gozdz et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,840,087). The Examiner has essentially alleged that cited references teach what is disclosed and claimed in the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse this rejection.

In response, claim 7 has been amended. Applicants' new independent claim 7, claims a method of manufacturing a solid-electrolyte battery by forming solid-electrolyte layers from each of the positive and negative electrodes that are laminated directly without a separator. This is clearly unlike any of the cited references, which fail to disclose or even suggest that a the lamination step should be done without a separator.

In stark contrast, Narang et al. specifically discloses that a mechanical separator should be employed to separate the anode from the cathode. (See Col. 11, lines 13-17.) Also, Schneider

et al. actually discloses an electrode and separator composite comprises a separator and an electrode embedded in a polymer matrix. (See abstract; fig. 1.) Finally, Gozdz et al. discloses the formation of a unitary laminate rechargeable battery comprising electrode and separator. (See abstract; col. 5, lines 52-55.)

Thus, unlike Applicants' claim 7, the cited references fail to disclose or even suggest a laminating process of the positive and negative electrodes directly without a separator which allows lithium ions to satisfactorily be doped into the negative electrode when a charging operation is performed. Applicants' claim 7 allows the energy density to be raised and the heavy-load resistance to be improved. Moreover, deposition of lithium can be prevented. (Specification pages 5-6.) Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time when the invention was made to combine the references as suggested by the Examiner to derive what is recited in claim 7.


Claims 8-10 all depend directly from claim 7 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reason that claim 7 is allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit this rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the pending claims 7-10 are patentable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL

 (Reg. No. 32,919)
David R. Metzger

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL

Customer Account No. 26263

P.O. Box 061080 - Wacker Drive Station

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone (312) 876-2578

Attorneys for Applicants

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL


P.O. Box #061080

Wacker Drive Station-Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

(312)876-2578

I hereby certify that this document and any being referred to as attached or enclosed is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on


Signature

4-11-03
Date